

REMARKS

In an Office Action mailed on June 30, 2004, claims 1-3, 8-13, 16-20 and 22-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Helms; and claims 4-7, 14, 15 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms. Claims 1-10, 15 and 21 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the §§ 102 and 103 rejections of these claims moot. Newly added claims 28-30 are patentable over the cited art. The §§ 102 and 103 rejections are addressed below.

Rejections of Claims 11-14, 16 and 17:

As amended, the method of independent claim 11 includes validating the indication of the first supply voltage level and in response to the validation of the indication, establishing a voltage of a terminal substantially at the first supply voltage level.

Contrary to the limitations of amended independent claim 1, Helms discloses a delay for purposes of ensuring that the processor drives program operating voltage setting signals to the proper levels. *See, for example*, Helms, 5:25-26. Thus, after the expiration of this delay, Helms discloses that a power good signal is asserted and then a multiplexer furnishes the appropriate voltage identification signals to the DC/DC converter so that the processor is powered at the programmed operating voltage setting. *See, for example*, Helms, 5:24-30.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 15, a claim that contains similar limitations to claim 11, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Helms. In this rejection, the Examiner states, "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Helms to validate indication prior to furnishing the terminal at the first supply voltage level. Office Action, 6. Applicant points out that a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires a suggestion or motivation in the art to make a modification to a prior art reference to derive the claimed invention. M.P.E.P. § 2143.

As discussed above, Helms clearly describes a delay in an attempt to ensure that the voltage identification signals are correct. This is unlike the claimed invention, however, in that the claimed invention relates to validating an indication of a supply voltage level and establishing a terminal voltage in response to this validation. Thus, the advantages that flow from the claimed invention cannot be achieved using the arrangement that is set forth in Helms. Thus, without a suggestion or motivation in the art to modify Helms to derive the limitations of

amended independent claim 11, claim 11 is neither anticipated by Helms nor is rendered obvious by the art of record. Therefore, allowance of claim 11 is requested.

Claims 12-14, 16 and 17 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons that are set forth above, allowance of 11-14, 16 and 17 is requested.

Rejections of Claims 18-20, 22 and 23:

As amended, the system of independent claim 18 includes a voltage regulator to regulate a voltage of the terminal substantially at the first supply voltage level in response to validation of the indication.

As set forth above in the discussion of claim 11, Helms fails to teach or suggest regulating a voltage in response to the validation of an indication of a voltage level. Instead, Helms teaches waiting for a power good signal and suggests waiting for a delay to elapse. Thus, for at least this reason, Helms fails to teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 18. Furthermore, the DC/DC converter of Helms does not perform the delay that is disclosed in Helms and does not provide any type of safeguard against improper voltage identification signals. Thus, for at least this additional, independent reason, Helms fails to teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 18.

Claims 19, 20, 22 and 23 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons that are set forth above, allowance of claims 18-20, 22 and 23 is requested.

Rejections of Claims 24-28:

As amended, the voltage regulator of independent claim 24 includes a circuit to, validate an indication of a supply voltage level furnished by an electronic device, and in response to the validation, set a reference voltage at a second supply voltage level to cause voltage regulation circuitry to regulate an output voltage substantially at a supply voltage level indicated by the electronic device.

As set forth above in the discussion of independent claim 18, Helms fails to disclose any specific details regarding the structure of the DC/DC converter. Thus, for at least this reason, Helms fails to describe the circuit of claim 24. Furthermore, Helms fails to teach or suggest

validation of an indication of a supply voltage level; thus, for at least this additional, independent reason, Helms fails to teach or suggest the voltage regulator of claim 24.

Claims 25-28 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from an allowable claim. Thus, for at least the reasons that are set forth above, allowance of claims 24-28 is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections and a favorable action in form of a Notice of Allowance are requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0548US).

Date: July 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Fred G. Pruner, Jr., Registration No. 40,779
Trop, Pruner, Hu
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
(713) 468-8880
(713) 468-8883 (fax)